and Pitha. The Examiner states that lines 18 to 21 of page 1 teach aqueous solutions of paracetamol and cites XP739 and XP817 as showing paracetamol compositions containing water and alcohol, XP737 and XP749 are cited to show adjustment of pH in the aqueous solution of paracetamol, XP816 is cited to show the use of an antioxidant for stabilization, Fuisz is cited in lines 60 to 63 of column 3 as teaching aqueous suspensions of paracetamol and isopropanol. Ratneraj et al is cited as showing compositions containing sugar, sorbitol, and WO 595 is cited to show a 1% to 50% of aqueous solution and Pitha is cited to show that paracetamol can be combined with various different compositions. The Examiner deems that the invention would be obvious therefrom.

Applicants respectfully traverse these grounds of rejection since the combination of the references would neither anticipate nor render obvious Applicants' novel stable liquid formulations consisting essentially of acetaminophen dispersed in an aqueous medium containing a buffering agent and at least one member of the group consisting of a free radical scavenger and a free radical antagonist in contrast to the prior art as taught in the beginning of the specification and specifically, lines 18 to 21 of page 1 in the application and as taught by XP739, would not expect to obtain Applicants' compositions and the unexpectedly stable formulations in the presence of water. With respect to the disclosure on page 1, this teaches that aqueous solutions of paracetamol are unstable in contrast to Applicants' stable compositions. The Examiner's

B

attention is directed to Example 2.3 on page 17 where it is shown that the presence of the free radical scavenger clearly increases the stability of the formulation. Example 3 indicates the advantage of adjusting the pH and the advantage of diluting aqueous solutions. Example 4 is directed to the stabilization of paracetamol by removing oxygen by bubbling the nitrogen therethrough. Example 5 shows the effect of stabilizing the paracetamol solution by the addition of free radical antagonist. Example 6 is directed to the advantages of the use of a morphinic compound by addition of a free radical scavenger and Example 7 shows the biological tolerance with respect to Applicants' compositions. None of the references teach Applicants' compositions.

None of the compositions teach Applicants' specific compositions as presently claimed and the compositions are not rendered obvious or anticipated. The XP739 reference merely shows a paracetamol composition containing water, sorbite, propyleneglycol, saccrose and ethanol chloroform and flavorings and aromas which are not Applicants' compositions. The same is true for the other references cited by the Examiner. Therefore, withdrawal of these grounds of rejection is requested.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly point out Applicants' patentable contribution and favorable reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Bierman, Muserlian and Lucas

By: 
Charles A. Muserlian #19,683
Attorney for Applicants
Tel.# (212) 661-8000

CAM:ds
Encl.: Check for $9.00
Return receipt postcard